

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 15, 2005, has been considered by the Applicants. Claims 1, 27, 28, 30, and 31 have been amended. Claims 9 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23-31 remain pending. Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. Applicants have cancelled claim 9, so this rejection is moot.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly state that the polymer coating comprises a conductive polymer selected from polyaniline or polypyrrole. This was the intended meaning and this amendment does not change the scope of the claim. The Examiner's interpretation, as stated in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, was correct. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-6, 9-21, 23, 24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Drappel (US 6,391,509). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Drappel does not teach all limitations of independent claims 1, 27, 28, 30, and 31. The Examiner takes the position that Drappel teaches a polymer coating containing about 5 wt% conductive polymer and states that this includes values above and below 5. The independent claims have been amended to recite an upper range of below about 5 wt%. This change in wording removes the possibility of overlap with Drappel. Therefore, Drappel does not anticipate the instant claims or their dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-21, 23, 24, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Drappel. Applicants traverse the rejections.

As discussed above, Drappel does not teach all claim limitations. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Drappel in view of Viswanathan (US 6,764,617). Applicants traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Drappel does not teach all claim limitations. Viswanathan does not correct this deficiency in the amount of conductive polymer present in the polymer coating. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, it is submitted all pending claims (claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23-31) are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

It is believed that no fee is due in conjunction with this response. If, however, it is determined that fees are due, authorization is hereby given for deduction of those fees, other than the issue fees, from Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH
& McKEE LLP



Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 861-5582